

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned wishes to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview on October 14, 2009. The claim amendments were discussed relative to the cited references, but no definite agreement was reached.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 12-14, 17, 21-29, 30-32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0018700) in view of Evans et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0033283). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially it will be noted that independent claim 1 has been amended to more positively recite the use of a “subscription router” and a “table” that the subscription router accesses to determine which one of a plurality of entities is to receive the first information. For the Examiner’s convenience claim 1 is presented below in full:

1. *(Currently Amended) A method of communicating information between heterogenous systems, the method comprising:*

providing a publisher/subscriber architecture having a subscription manager for generating a subscription and acting as a proxy subscriber on a first network to receive first information over the first network relating to the subscription, for use by a [[an]]

specific entity communicating with the publisher/subscriber architecture over [[on]] a second network; [[,]]
using a subscription router to receive the first information;
using the subscription router to access a table to determine which one of a plurality of different entities in communication with the publisher/subscriber architecture, and that have each previously provided a subscription request to the publisher/subscriber architecture, are to receive the first information;
accepting a first information from the first network according to the subscription;
using the table to determine specifically which one or more of the entities are to receive the first information, and transmitting the first information to the one or more of the entities entity in accordance with [[the]] subscription information from the table;[[,]]
using a publication manager of the publisher/subscriber architecture to accept a second information from the one or more of the entities entity, and to act as a publisher of the second information for the one or more of the entities entity to at least one remote entity; and
for at least one of the publisher and subscriber operations, using the publisher/subscriber architecture to automatically register the one or more of the entities entity to implement one of the publishing and subscription operations without a registration action by the one or more of the entities entity.

Independent claim 24 has been amended along somewhat similar lines.

It is respectfully asserted that the operations set forth in claim 1 are not rendered obvious by the Giroti and Evans et al. combination of references. Giroti has been discussed in detail in the prior filed response by the undersigned, but it bears repeating that Giroti does not disclose or even remotely suggest the limitations now included in independent claim 1. Giroti makes use of an integrated application delivery system ("IADS") 10 (see Figure 2) that coordinates communications between each of several devices (e.g., PDA 24, phone 26 and PC/PDA 28) and an enterprise IP network 12. It appears that the IADS 10 essentially is just acting as a "translator" to receive independent communications from each of the devices 24-28 and to route the

communications (whether they be requests for data or application use) to the appropriate application 14 or database 16 via the enterprise IP network 12. Giroti does mention that the IADS 10 could deliver information to specific devices based on detecting the device type during initial operation of the device (col. 3, lines 60-63), but this still does not disclose or suggest the use of a “subscription router” and subscription “table”. The Giroti system also appears reliant on responding to distinct, independent messages or transmissions from specific user devices, whereas the present method and system is able to forward subscription information to any entity that has previously registered with the publisher/subscriber architecture, without such information being in response to a specific, discrete request for information. Thus, once a subscription is recorded for a specific entity, all information generated from one or more remote entities will be obtained by the publisher/subscriber architecture and forwarded to the subscribed entity, even in the absence of a discrete request for information by the entity. In summary, there is absolutely no suggestion in Giroti that a “subscription router” may be employed to access a “table” that informs the router exactly which one or more of the entities is to receive the first information (i.e., subscription information).

Evans et al. has been cited to show a data distribution system 110 that has access to published updates to data sets, where the published updates are made available from data servers 115. It is explained that the data distribution system 110 forwards the data set to a subscribing proxy server 100 to enable updating of a respective data set that has been previously cached copy of the data set. Evans et al. does not suggest that the proxy server is in communication with an entity that is making a subscription request via one network, and/or which needs to publish information to

one or more remote entities via a different network. Evans et al. also does not suggest using a subscription router and a table to determine which entity is to receive subscription information received from one or more remote devices. In short, Evans et al. does not suggest, either by itself or in connection with Giroti, the range of operational features set forth in claim 1 that enable the publisher/subscriber architecture to determine which one of one or more entities is to receive the subscription information (i.e., the “first information” in claim 1), nor is there any suggestion about incorporating a publication feature as set forth in claim 1.

It will be noted that amended independent claim 12 now specifically calls out a “subscription and publication table” that includes information not only on which entities are to receive subscription information, but also which remote devices are to receive published information from the publisher/subscriber architecture. For the Examiner’s convenience claim 12 is reprinted below as follows:

12. *(Currently Amended) An agent, to be interposed between a first network and a second network, the agent comprising:*

[[an]] a network interface to [[an]] a specific entity, the specific entity interface including a first protocol for communicating with the specific entity over the first network; and

an interface to a publisher/subscriber architecture on the second network, the publisher/subscriber architecture including:

a publication manager that determines [[what]] which one of a plurality of remote entity entities is to receive a first quantity of information that is received by the agent from the specific entity and published by the agent; and

a subscription manager that establishes at least one subscription for the specific entity to receive publications from at least a selected one of the plurality of remote entity entities; [[.]]

a subscription router that receives the publications from the selected one of the remote entities;

a subscription and publication table that the subscription router accesses to hold subscription information pertaining to which ones of a plurality of different entities are to receive subscription

information from the subscription router, and to identify that the subscription information is to be transmitted to the specific entity; and

the subscription and publication table also holding publication information as to which one or more of said pluralities of remote entities said publications from said specific entity are to be published to.

These features even further distinguish independent claim 12 from the Giroti/Evans et al. combination. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of the aforementioned claims in view of Giroti/Evans et al. is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. in view of Evans et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Chou et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0018796). In view of the amendments to independent claims 1 and 12, and the remarks presented above, it is believed that this rejection has been rendered moot. Nevertheless, the undersigned wishes to note that Chou et al., which is related to a transcoding multimedia information being transmitted within a network communication system, provides no suggestion of using a subscription router or a table to manage the distribution of subscription information to one or more entities.

Claims 8, 9, 10, 18-20 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. in view of Ennis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,356,529) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Nedbal (U.S. Pat. No. 7,107,574). In view of the amendments to independent claims 1, 12 and 24, and the remarks presented in accordance with the amendments, it is believed that this rejection has been rendered moot.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. in view of Evans et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Ennis et al. and Mueller et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0027867). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. in view of Evans et al. as applied to claim 12, and further in view of Ennis et al. Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroti et al. in view of Evans et al. as applied to claim 32, and further in view of McCall et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0188522). In view of the amendments to the independent claims and the remarks presented above, it is believed that these rejections to selected ones of the dependent claims have been rendered moot. The undersigned also wishes to note for the record that none of the Ennis et al., Mueller et al. or McCall et al. references even remotely discloses or suggests the subject matter of any of amended independent claims 1, 12 or 24.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: 23 October 2009

Respectfully submitted,

 36,626
for

Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/chs

14737741.1